

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested. The present amendment is responsive to the Office Action of March 2, 2006, in which claims 1-12 were previously pending. Of those, claims 5-9 have been withdrawn from consideration. Of the remaining claims under consideration, claims 1, 2, 4 and 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,092,678 to Kawano, et al. As to claim 3, the Examiner indicates that it has not been considered because there appears to be missing language. An objection thereto has resulted under 37 CFR 1.75(c) for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. For the following reasons, however, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

As initial matter, the abstract of the disclosure has been amended as set forth above so as to overcome the objection thereto. Applicants thus respectfully request withdrawal of the same.

Insofar as the objection to claim 3 (and withdrawn consideration thereof) for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim, Applicants have provided herewith a copy of the entirety of claim 3 from the electronically filed application, which has been published and is available on the public PAIR website of the USPTO. As can be seen, although claim 3 begins at the bottom of the first page of the claims with: "The method of claim 1, wherein said light beams are", the top of the next page of the claims reads "transmitted by a laser." prior to claim 4.

Thus, because the entirety of claim 3 was in fact included in the application as originally filed, consideration of the same following the present submission should not be considered a new issue. Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject

matter of originally filed claim 3 (as discussed in more detail below) and withdrawal of the objection thereto.

With regard to the §112, first paragraph rejection of claim 2, the Examiner has indicated that the original specification is silent as to the specifics of the tool map being stored internally in the overhead transport vehicle. The Applicants first direct the Examiner's attention to paragraph [0020] of the electronically filed specification, which states in part:

“Vehicle 115 adds a tool identification to the *AMHS' internal tool map* at step 310.” (Emphasis added)

Further, paragraph [0022] states in pertinent part:

“At step 414, *vehicle 115* internally compensates for the offset and adds the new tool ID and offset to *its internal tool map*.” (Emphasis added)

Thus, as clearly set forth in the specification, there is enabling support for claim 2 and, as such, Applicants respectfully traverse the §112, first paragraph rejection thereto and request that the same be withdrawn.

Turning now to the substantive §103 rejection of claims 1, 2, 4 and 10-12 based on the Kawano reference, claims 1 and 10 have been amended as set forth above to more particularly point out that light sources are collimated sources. Further, dependent claim 3 and newly added claim 13 further recite that the collimated light sources are lasers. Support for these amendments may be found at least in paragraphs [0016] and [0018] of the electronically filed specification.

In contrast, Kawano only teaches the use of LEDs (light emitting diodes) as a light source. (See for example, column 4, lines 46-51 and lines 62-65.) As this type of light source is a non-collimated light source, Kawano is missing at least one element of the claims under consideration. Therefore, the claims are not obvious in view of Kawano, as

they define a system and method capable of distance verification and offset determination at longer distances.


Moreover, as to claim 2 and newly added claim 14, it is respectfully submitted that even if it is obvious (inherent) for Kawano to disclose a tool map containing distance between load ports/production tools and the identification of each load port so that the controller can perform specific teaching and moving of the OHT to the load ports, such a tool map is not internal to the overhead transport vehicle. Rather, the teaching device 13 of Kawano is shown in Figures 1, 2 and 4 to be a discrete component in communication with the position detection portions 12 of the positional deviation fixture 11. Whereas the Kawano teaching device 13 includes memory elements 15a, 15b (Figure 2, col. 5, lines 10-13), the moving carriage 10 is not shown or described in a manner so as to include any components that would indicate a tool map is stored internally therein.

Accordingly, for these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the §103 rejections to claim 2 and newly added claim 14, and further reiterate that support for the same is found in the specification as originally filed.

For the above stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered and no additional fees are believed to be required. However, if any fees are due with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0458 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,  
RAY A. REYES, ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
Applicants' Attorneys

By   
Sean F. Sullivan  
Registration No. 38,328  
Customer No. 29371

Date: May 4, 2006  
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929